

### REMARKS

In the June 22, 2007 Office Action, claims 1 and 3-24 stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

#### ***Status of Claims and Amendments***

In response to the June 22, 2007 Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 4, 10-13, 19-21, and 24 and cancelled 6-8, 16, 17, 22, and 23 as indicated above. Thus, claims 1, 3-5, 9-15, 18-21, and 24 are pending, with claims 1, 11, 12, 13, 19, 20, 21, and 24 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

#### ***Interview Summary***

On September 11, 2007, the undersigned conducted a personal interview with Examiner Kayes, who is in charge of the above-identified patent application. Applicants wish to thank Examiner Kayese for the opportunity to discuss the above-identified patent application during the Interview of September 11, 2007.

#### ***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

In items 1-6 of the Office Action, claims 1, 9, 13, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,262,763 (Okuyama) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001-036264 (Ito). In response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 13, and 21 as mentioned above.

More specifically, independent claims 1 and 13 now clearly recite that the operation key is configured and arranged to be operated by a user, and that the time adjusting section is configured and arranged to reset positioning of hands of the index section of the analog clock by returning the hands to an initial position, to eliminate misalignment by moving the hands

to the initial position upon the user using the operation key after resetting positioning of the hands, if the hands are misaligned, and to adjust the time displayed in the internal display section and the time displayed by the analog clock to display an adjusted time thereafter upon the user using the operation key. Neither Okuyama nor Ito has the operation key to adjust both the time in the analog clock and the time in the internal display by resetting the hands, eliminating misalignment, and adjusting the hands to the adjusted time, as claimed in claims 1 and 13.

Applicants have amended claim 21 to recite that an operation key is configured to be operated by a user to correct the time information displayed in the internal display section and the time information displayed in the analog quartz clock in an interdependent manner. Okuyama was cited in the Office Action to have an internal display displaying time information and an analog clock displaying time, but it does not disclose correcting both of the time in an interdependent manner. Also, Ito is silent about this configuration.

In items 7-9 of the Office Action, claims 22-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,262,763 (Okuyama) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001-036264 (Ito) and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003-063525 (Richardson). In response, Applicants have canceled claims 22-23 as mentioned above rendering the rejections moot.

In items 10 and 11 of the Office Action, claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,985,878 (Yamada) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,246,602 (Sekiya). In response, Applicants have amended claim 24 as mentioned above.

More specifically, Applicants have amended claim 24 to recite that the time adjusting section is configured and arranged to reset positioning of hands of the index section of the

analog clock by returning the hands to an initial position, to eliminate misalignment by moving the hands to the initial position upon the user using the operation key after resetting positioning of the hands, if the hands are misaligned, and to adjust the time displayed in the internal display section and the time displayed by the analog clock to display an adjusted time thereafter upon the user using the operation key. Yamada was cited in the Office Action to show the internal display section displaying time information and the analog clock displaying time. Sekiya was cited in the Office Action to have the time adjusting section. However, neither Yamada nor Sekiya has the operation key to adjust both the time in the analog clock and the time in the internal display by resetting the hands, eliminating misalignment, and adjusting the hands to the adjusted time, as recited in claim 24.

In items 12-19 of the Office Action, claims 3-6 and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,262,763 (Okuyama), in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001-036264 (Ito) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,246,602 (Sekiya). In items 24-26 of the Office Action, claims 10 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,262,763 (Okuyama), in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001-036264 (Ito), and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003-063525 (Richardson). In response, Applicants have amended claim independent claims 1 and 13 and canceled claims 6 and 16 as mentioned above.

Richardson was cited in the Office Action to have the detecting section for determining the position of the hands and providing the information for the purposes of correcting time, but is silent regarding the operation key to adjust both the time in the analog clock and the time in the internal display by resetting the hands, eliminating misalignment, and adjusting the hands to the adjusted time, as claimed in claim 1 and 13.

Applicants respectfully believe that the dependent 3-5, 10, 14, 15, and 18 are allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claims 1 or 13, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 3-5, 10, 14, 15, and 18 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claims 1 and 13, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in the dependent claims.

In items 20-23 of the Office Action, claims 7, 8, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,262,763 (Okuyama), in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001-036264 (Ito), U.S. Patent No. 4,246,602 (Sekiya), and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003-063525 (Richardson). In response, Applicants have canceled claims 7, 8, and 17 as mentioned above rendering the rejections moot.

In items 27-31 of the Office Action, claims 11, 12, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,262,763 (Okuyama), in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001-036264 (Ito), U.S. Patent No. 4,246,602 (Sekiya), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003-063525 (Richardson), and U.S. Patent No. 6,396,772 (Yabe). In response, Applicants have amended claims 11, 12, 19, and 20.

More specifically, independent claims 11, 12, 19, and 20 now recite that the operation key is configured and arranged to be operated by a user, and that the time adjusting section is configured and arranged to reset positioning of hands of the index section of the analog clock by returning the hands to an initial position, to eliminate misalignment by moving the hands to the initial position upon the user using the operation key after resetting positioning of the hands, if the hands are misaligned, and to adjust the time displayed in the internal display section and the time displayed by the analog clock to display an adjusted time thereafter upon

the user using the operation key. Neither Okuyama, Ito, Sekiya, Richardson, nor Yabe has the operation key to adjust both the time in the analog clock and the time in the internal display by resetting the hands, eliminating misalignment, and adjusting the hands to the adjusted time, as claimed in claims 11, 12, 19, and 20.

Applicants respectfully assert that the recited arrangements are *not* disclosed or suggested by Okuyama, Ito, Yamada, Sekiya, Richardson, Yabe, or any other prior art of record. It is well settled in U.S. patent law that the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does *not* make the modification obvious, unless the prior art *suggests* the desirability of the modification. Accordingly, the prior art of record lacks any suggestion or expectation of success for combining the patents to create the Applicants' unique arrangement of a cellular phone and/or personal digital assistant. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of rejections in view of the above comments and amendments.

#### ***Prior Art Citation***


In the Office Action, additional prior art references were made of record. Applicants believe that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

\* \* \*

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1, 3-5, 9-15, 18-21, and 24 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/734,588  
Amendment dated September 24, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of June 22, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

  
Todd M. Guise  
Reg. No. 46,748

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP  
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202)-293-0444  
Dated: 9/24/07

S:\09-SEP07-AO\SE-US035175 Amendment.doc